



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/669,976 09/24/2003		Holger Engel	QGN-038.1 US	8390	
29425	7590 05/18/2006		EXAMINER		
LEON R. Y.	ANKWICH	I	MUMMERT, STEPHANIE KANE		
YANKWICH	ł & ASSOCI	ATES			
201 BROAD	WAY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CAMBRIDG	E, MA 021	139	. 1637		
				DATE MAIL ED: 05/19/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	Application No. Applicant(s)						
Office Action Summary			976	ENGEL ET AL.	ENGEL ET AL.				
			er	Art Unit					
			ie K. Mummert	1637					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on t	he cover sheet with	h the correspondence ac	ddress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA asions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply within	ILING DATE OF 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ication. tory period will apply and II, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNIC event, however, may a rep will expire SIX (6) MONT opplication to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this of the control of th	,				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			non-final						
	,—								
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dienoeiti	on of Claims	andor Expanto	(day)0, 1000 0.2.	., 100 0.0.210.					
·									
• —	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
-	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
·	Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
·									
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> are subject to restriction	and/or election r	equirement.						
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.									
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have be	en received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the Internationa	al Bureau (PCT R	ule 17.2(a)).						
* S	see the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the ce	tified copies not re	eceived.					
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			immary (PTO-413)					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0 nation Disclosure Statement(s)			/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PT	O-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date	(סטוספוט ו	6) Other:		,				

Application/Control Number: 10/669,976 Page 2

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-16, drawn to a method of co-amplification, classified in class 435, subclass 91.2.
- II. Claims 17-22, drawn to an amplification reaction kit or device comprising amplification reagents and a solid support, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the amplification reaction kit or device can be used in methods of labeling of polynucleotides or in methods of sequencing. The amplification reaction kit and device of group II can be used in methods that are separate and distinct from the method of coamplification described in group I. For this reason, to fully search the amplification kit and device of group II would require terms directed specifically to the components of the amplification kit, terms which would not necessarily address the method of coamplification of group I. Therefore, because a search of each of these inventions would require separate searches of the prior art which are not overlapping in terms or in scope, it would pose an undue burden on the examiner to require a search of both of these groups of invention together.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Page 3

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found

Art Unit: 1637

allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephanie K. Mummert whose telephone number is 571-272-8503. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5.

Application/Control Number: 10/669,976 Page 5

Art Unit: 1637

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Styphanie K. Mumbert

Examiner
Art Unit 1637

SKM

JEFFREY FREDMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER